

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-24 were previously pending in this application. By the above amendments, claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-24 are currently pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Within the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,006,087 issued to Amin (hereinafter “Amin”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amin teaches a system to deliver a voice mail notification including an index to a subscriber to indicate that a voice mail message is waiting in a subscriber mailbox. A subscriber utilizes a voice mail system for receiving voice mail messages (Amin, col. 1, lines 30-40). Amin does not teach a messaging system configured to store and retrieve multiple different message types, such as voice messages, fax messages, and email messages as found in a unified messaging system. As such, the voice mail notification of Amin is solely directed to voice mail messages. Amin does not teach a notification directed to multiple different message formats.

In contrast, the amended independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 include the limitation “wherein the updated mailbox content list comprises a list of stored messages with multiple different message formats.” As described above, Amin does not teach a notification directed to multiple different message formats, as claimed. For at least this reason, the amended independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 are allowable over Amin.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,535,586 issued to Cloutier et al. (hereinafter “Cloutier”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,212 issued to Stein et al. (hereinafter “Stein”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Cloutier teaches a system to provide messaging services to alert a message service subscriber to the receipt of a high priority message and to provide the remote retrieval thereof. An email server 110 stores email messages received over the internet 130 (Cloutier, col. 1, lines 26-27). A messaging system server 120 provides access to the email server 110 via the internet

130 such that notification of high priority email messages received on the email server 110 are provided by transmitting a wireless message to a wireless device 170 used by the subscriber (Cloutier, col. 3, lines 62-66). The messaging system server 120 periodically polls the email server 110 for new messages, and if a new email message is received, then a unique message code corresponding to the new email message is generated by the messaging system server 120 (Cloutier, col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 4). The unique message code is sent from the messaging system server 120 to the wireless device 170 used by the subscriber (Cloutier, col. 5, lines 17-22). To retrieve the new email message, the subscriber accesses the messaging system server 120 using an access device 190 connected via a user interface 140 (Cloutier, col. 4, lines 26-38).

Stein teaches a system to provide email services across a network. A mobile device 200 is coupled to a network gateway 106 via a wireless network 108. The network gateway 106 is coupled to a mail server 110. The mobile device 200 is used to perform email functions associated with the mail server 110. In order to perform these functions, the mobile device 200 must first download corresponding resources from the mail server 110 to the mobile device memory 204. These resources include email message lists, contents of the messages, menu and data entry screens.

Both Cloutier and Stein teach systems specifically directed to email services and email messages. Neither Stein, nor Cloutier teach a messaging system configured to store and retrieve multiple different message types, such as voice messages, fax messages, and email messages as found in a unified messaging system. As such, the notification of Cloutier and the email list of Stein are solely directed to email messages. Neither Cloutier, Stein, nor their combination teach a notification directed to multiple different message formats.

In contrast, the amended independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 include the limitation “wherein the updated mailbox content list comprises a list of stored messages with multiple different message formats.” As described above, neither Cloutier, Stein, nor their combination teach a notification directed to multiple different message formats, as claimed. For at least this reason, the amended independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 are allowable over Cloutier, Stein, and their combination.

Claims 2 and 4-6 are all dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over Amin and Cloutier in view of Stein. Accordingly, claims 2 and 4-6 are each also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 9-11 are dependent on the independent claim 7. As discussed above, the amended independent claim 7 is allowable over Amin and Cloutier in view of Stein. As such, the dependent claims 9-11 are each also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 16-18 are all dependent upon the independent claim 14. As discussed above, the independent claim 14 is allowable over Amin and Cloutier in view of Stein. Accordingly, claims 16-18 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 20 and 22-24 are all dependent upon the independent claim 19. As discussed above, the independent claim 19 is allowable over Amin and Cloutier in view of Stein. Accordingly, claims 20 and 22-24 are all also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, claims 3, 8, 15, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cloutier in view of Stein and further in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants agree that low data-bandwidth and high data latency networks are known in the art. However, the Applicants do not agree that the methods of claims 1 and 14, and the systems of claims 7 and 19, including a low data bandwidth, high data latency wireless network, as claimed in dependent claims 3, 8, 15, and 21, are well known in the art.

Further, claim 3 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. Claim 8 is dependent on the independent claim 7. Claim 15 is dependent on the independent claim 14. Claim 21 is dependent on the independent claim 19. As discussed above, the independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 19 are each allowable over Cloutier, Stein, and their combination. As such, the dependent claims 3, 8, 15, and 21 are each also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.



PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: AVAYA-01800

For at least the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be greatly appreciated. If the Examiner should have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: 10-30-07

By:

Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No. 32,571
Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 10-30-07 By: Alicia Ferrara